

KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)
United States Attorney

E-filed 9/29/06

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)
Chief, Criminal Division

SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)
Assistant United States Attorney

150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 535-5056
FAX: (408) 535-5066
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

WILETTE JOY PARKER,

Defendant.

No. 06-00588 JW/HRL

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

SAN JOSE VENUE

On September 14, 2006, the undersigned parties appeared before the Court for arraignment on an indictment. After the defendant was arraigned and entered a plea of not guilty, the parties jointly requested that the case be placed on Judge Ware's calendar on October 23, 2006 for a status hearing. The government needs to provide additional discovery to the defendant, and an October appearance will allow the government to obtain the requested documents and provide them to defense counsel. In addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from September 14, 2006 to October 23, 2006. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for continuity and effective

preparation of counsel.

SO STIPULATED:

KEVIN V. RYAN
United States Attorney

DATED: _____

/s/
SUSAN KNIGHT
Assistant United States Attorney


DATED: _____

/s/
GUY J. CAPUTO
Counsel for Ms. Parker

Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act from September 14, 2006 until October 23, 2006. The Court finds, based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: 9/29/06 _____


HOWARD R. LLOYD
United States Magistrate Judge